



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/728,077	12/04/2003	Fabienne Pianta	2794-1-001	7960
7590 KLAUBER & JACKSON 4th Floor 411 Hackensack Avenue Hackensack, NJ 07601				
02/11/2008				
EXAMINER				
FORTUNA, JOSE A				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1791				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
02/11/2008		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/728,077

**Applicant(s)**

PIANTA ET AL.

**Examiner**

José A. Fortuna

**Art Unit**

1791

**Period for Reply** -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 January 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 and 26-43 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24, 26-43 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 04 December 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB06)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Specification***

1. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: in paragraph [0034] applicants refer to a paste, e.g., virgin paste, recycle paste, etc.; the meaning of those terms is unclear. For the purpose of this office action the term paste has been interpreted as “pulp” i.e., virgin pulp, recycled pulp, etc.

Appropriate correction/clarification is required.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claim 40 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 40 is vague and indefinite as to the meaning in the context of the word “paste.” See also the objection to the specification, above. The claim is vague and indefinite, because the word “paste” does not identify a product, but its condition or state. Note that also the claim is also an omnibus claim since it claims all type of pastes and the metes and bounds of patent protection desired cannot be ascertained. Claim 40 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite in that it fails to point out what is included or excluded by the claim language. This claim is an omnibus type claim.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5. Claims 1-3, 6-8, 10-13, 17-18, 22-25, and 32-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Coleman, US Patent No. 4,008,121.

Regarding claims 1-3, 6-8, 10-13, 17-18 and 41-42, Coleman teaches a method of coating pigment particles on paper plies, in which the particles are coated/spread between a pair of plies. The pigments are preferably clay particles; same as claimed and they are used between 5 to 60 grams/m<sup>2</sup> or gsm, see abstract. Figure 1 shows that the spreading means are disposed in variable position with respect to the wet end, see nozzles 23-25. Coleman teaches that the preferred pigments particles are clay and titanium dioxide and that it is applied to the web in form of a suspension, which can contain a binder, preferably a starch, see column 1, lines 38-44. Coleman also teaches that the pigment can be incorporated into the web with or without the use of a binder and that spraying technique could be used, see column 2, lines 19-27. Regarding claims 22-25, the penetration of the pigment would be inherent to Coleman's invention, since this a property of the wet end of the papermaking system, i.e., the dewatering of a web in the wet end of a papermaking machine decreases downstream, and therefore, the closest to the headbox an additive is applied, the most it penetrates through the forming web. Note that the papermaking machine, at the wet end, includes vacuums underneath the forming wire. Coleman

teaches also that the web is formed into a paper or paperboard; see abstract and column 1, lines 22-27 for example. As to the different type of board machines of claim 24, Coleman shows the use of Fourdrinier machines in figure 1 and column 4, line 64 through column 5, line 12. With regard to claims 32-40, Coleman teaches the suspension of the filler/pigment and starch having overlapping amount of water, column 4, lines 32-49; also in the same lines Coleman teaches the speed of the web which falls within the claimed range.

Note that even though Coleman teaches that preferably the additives can be added to between the plies with a curtain coater, he also teaches that the additives can be added using sprayers, see column 2, lines 19-27. Note that sprayers in most of the cases use nozzles for better control of the flow.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35

U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

8. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).
9. Claims 4-5, 9, 14-16, 19-21 and 26-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Coleman, cited above.

Coleman has been discussed above. Coleman is silent with regard to the specifics of the above claims, i.e., the distance of the introduction of the fillers, nor the angle of inclination of the spray nozzles, nor the specifics of the fillers, e.g., types, such as calcium carbonate and calcium sulfate, size distribution, etc. However, the claimed fillers including the specific of them, e.g., size distributions, and different hydrates of the same compound, (Calcium Sulfate), are very well known in the art, and the use of such filler(s) would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art<sup>1</sup>. As to the use of sprays and the specific of the position of the spray with respect to web or the headbox, this is considered to be within the levels of ordinary skill in the art as an obvious optimization of a result effective variable, absent a showing of unexpected results. It has been held that “[T]he discovery of an optimum value of a result effective variable in a known process is

---

<sup>1</sup> The examiner takes official notice of this/these facts and would present proof if and/or when required.

ordinarily within the skill of the art. *In re Antoine*, 559 F.2d 618, 195 USPQ 6 (CCPA 1977); *In re Aller*, 42 CCPA 824, 220 F.2d 454, 105 USPQ 233 (1995).

10. Claims 1-17, 22-24, 26-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nicholson, US Patent No. 2,286,924.

Nicholson teaches a multiply/multilayer paper or paperboard in which additives such as sizing, pigments and fillers, are added in between the layers, see column 1, lines 34-55 and column 2, lines 11-16. Nicholson teaches that a Fourdrinier machine could be used and that the additives, including fillers, are added before the bonding of the plies and the same type of pulps, i.e., Virgin Kraft pulps can be used as the layers. Even though Nicholson is silent with regard to the specific of the filler additives, but the claimed fillers including the specific of them, e.g., size distributions, and different hydrates of the same compound, (Calcium Sulfate), are very well known in the art, and the use of such filler(s) would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art<sup>2</sup>. As to the use of sprays and the specific of the position of the spray with respect to web or the headbox, this is considered to be within the levels of ordinary skill in the art as an obvious optimization of a result effective variable, absent a showing of unexpected results. It has been held that "[T]he discovery of an optimum value of a result effective variable in a known process is ordinarily within the skill of the art. *In re Antoine*, 559 F.2d 618, 195 USPQ 6 (CCPA 1977); *In re Aller*, 42 CCPA 824, 220 F.2d 454, 105 USPQ 233 (1995). Note that the above claims are not limited to any kind of device(s) to add the additives and therefore, the reference reads on the above claims, as claimed.

---

<sup>2</sup> The examiner takes official notice of this/these facts and would present proof if and/or when required.

***Response to Arguments***

11. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-24 and 26-43 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Conclusion***

12. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure in the art of "Method of manufacturing a multi-layered pulp product."

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to José A. Fortuna whose telephone number is 571-272-1188. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Steven P. Griffin can be reached on 571-272-1189. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



Art Unit: 1791

José A Fortuna  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 1791

JAF

/José A Fortuna/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1791